

X. Evaluation of the Subreach Planning Process

Colusa Subreach Planning was the longest and most intensive of the three subreach planning processes along the Sacramento River corridor. It involved over four years of time and it focused on an extensive public engagement program that included 36 public meetings. These meetings included public input and information meetings, workshops, Advisory Workgroup meetings and Subgroup meetings. CSP was unique in that it was directed to address the questions and concerns of local stakeholders as part of ecosystem restoration planning.

CSP was also conducted during a time of heightened controversy regarding ecosystem restoration in the Sacramento River Conservation Area. During this period representatives from Colusa County expressed strong opinions and concerns regarding the need for landowner assurances to offset the perceived effects of various conservation and regulatory actions. Within this context, some local stakeholders withdrew from participation in Colusa Subreach Planning and requested that the planning process be terminated. The planning process was completed but there was a decrease in formal participation from some local stakeholders.

CSP constituted a substantial investment of time and resources on the part of CALFED, SRCAF and TNC as well as the individuals, groups and agencies that participated. Given that investment, it is appropriate that there be some introspective evaluation of the planning process. This Chapter reviews the stakeholder response to the process that was identified through the initial and final landowner surveys. It also includes an evaluation of the effectiveness of the various steps and activities within the planning process. Finally, it assesses whether the original Goal and Objectives of the project were met.

A. Landowner Survey Results

The Institute for Social Research at CSU Sacramento (ISR) was retained to conduct two surveys of landowners within the Colusa Subreach. The initial survey was conducted in early 2005 when the public engagement effort was being initiated and the final survey was conducted in early 2008 when the public engagement process was being completed. The purpose of the surveys was to determine landowner opinions regarding habitat conservation, their concerns regarding restoration of riparian habitat and their expectations of the planning process. The two surveys were intended to provide feedback as to changes in landowner opinions that occurred over the term of CSP.

The surveys were conducted by telephone and they followed a set format that was reviewed with the Advisory Workgroup in 2004. A listing of landowners was obtained from the Colusa and Glenn County Assessor's rolls in 2004 with an update in 2007. Surveyed landowners included those owning property inside of the flood protection levees and those owning property that adjoined the levees on the outside. Telephone numbers were obtained from the local telephone directory, various on-line search engines, SRCAF records and available local agency sources. A request

for phone numbers was also included in letters that were sent to Subreach landowners by the SRCAF prior to the initial and final surveys. These letters informed landowners that a telephone survey was going to be conducted and requested their participation.

The initial survey in 2005 consisted of six sections that addressed:

- Property characteristics
- Landowner awareness of SRCAF, the Colusa Subreach Planning effort and the agencies involved
- Confidence and trust in agencies providing technical information on the environmental impact of wildlife habitat restoration
- Expectations regarding the likely outcomes of habitat restoration in the Colusa Subreach
- Preferences for methods of communication between landowners and the planning process
- Additional contact information for the respondent

The final survey in 2008 was modified to reflect its occurrence near the conclusion of CSP. For example, the questions related to actual methods of communication utilized rather than those preferred. Also, contact information was not longer required.

The ISR interviewer made five attempts to reach each landowner. If a request for a call back was received on the fifth attempt, the call was returned as requested. If the landowner was not available at the time of the call, messages were left on answering machines or with others in the household or office. Upon reaching the respondent, the interviewer identified herself by name and her affiliation with the Institute for Social Research at CSUS. She briefly described the purpose of the call and asked to speak with the landowner who is most familiar with the management and uses of the property. If the initial respondent referred the interviewer to a tenant, manager or co-owner, the phone number was obtained and a call was made to the person recommended. Interview responses were recorded by hand, with extensive comments entered into the computer. Coded responses were entered into a data file for analysis.

A detailed analysis was prepared in report format by ISR to document the procedure and the results of both the initial and final surveys. These reports contain the raw survey results, cross tabulations of key responses and an analysis of responses. These reports were each presented to the Advisory Workgroup by the ISR interviewer. The initial and final survey reports are contained in Appendix D and E. These survey reports should be consulted for a complete review of the results of the surveys and the differences in responses that were noted between the initial and final surveys.

Initial Landowner Survey telephone calls began in January of 2005. Contact was attempted for 92 landowners in the Subreach. Telephone numbers for the remaining owners were unlisted and could not be obtained through the various means noted above. Of the 92 owners, there was a participation rate of 64% and a total of 60 landowners completed the interview. Of the interviewees, 90% were private owners and 10% were local, state or federal agencies. Seventy-two percent of the interviewees reported that their land was used for agricultural purposes and 61% of these owners farmed the land themselves. Of the interviewees, 43% lived on the subject property and the breakdown of other

residence locations was: 30% elsewhere in Colusa County, 4% elsewhere in Glenn County, 22% in another California county.

Responses from landowners to selected questions were as follows:

- Fifty-seven percent had heard of the SRCAF.
- Fifty-seven percent had heard of CSP.
- Twenty-nine percent knew the general geographic boundaries of CSP.
- The greatest confidence was placed in technical information provided by local agencies (6.43 to 7.04 out of 10) followed by state and federal agencies (5.04 to 5.88 out of 10).
- The most useful methods of communicating were expected to be mailing brief issue-specific flyers (87%), attending general formation meetings (81%) and attending issue-specific meetings (72%).

Awareness of CSP and the SRCAF was highest with owners that lived in Colusa and Glenn Counties and local owners tended to stress the importance of involvement by local agencies and organizations. A majority of the owners expressed concerns that possible outcomes of restoration could include increases in wildlife populations and negative impacts that included decrease in agricultural income, decrease in local tax income, decrease in property values increase in flooding and increased damage due to insects, rodents and deer and increased trespassing.

Final Landowner Survey telephone calls were initiated in January of 2008. Contact was attempted for 93 landowners in the Subreach. Of the 93 owners, there was a participation rate of 51% and a total of 47 landowners completed the interview. Of the interviewees, 83% were private owners and 17% were local, state or federal agencies. Sixty-nine percent of the interviewees reported that their land was used for agricultural purposes and 74% of these owners farmed the land themselves. Of the interviewees, 38% lived on the subject property and the breakdown of other residence locations was: 18% elsewhere in Colusa County, 5% elsewhere in Glenn County, 36% in another California county. Survey participation was on a voluntary basis and the methodology did not include determination of the degree to which the respondents in 2008 were the same individuals that responded in 2005.

Responses from landowners to selected questions were as follows:

- Eighty-two percent had heard of the SRCAF, up from 57% in 2005.
- Ninety-two percent heard of CSP, up from 57% in 2005.
- Forty-seven percent knew the general geographic boundaries of CSP, up from 29% in 2005.
- The greatest confidence was placed in technical information provided by local agencies (5.44 to 7.03 out of 10) followed by State and federal agencies (4.89 to 5.67 out of 10), generally consistent with the 2005 results.
- The most useful methods of communicating with landowners were found to be newspaper articles (39%), attending general formation meetings (34%), attending a meeting for landowners adjoining a restoration site (34%) and annual CSP newsletters (34%).

Awareness of CSP and the involvement of TNC and SRCAF increased substantially over the three year period. This awareness did not result in

increased confidence in SRCAF or the perceived objectivity of the process. The confidence level in the SRCAF was slightly lower and a new question regarding confidence in TNC indicated that the confidence level for TNC was lower than that felt for SRCAF. A comparison to TNC confidence levels from 2005 was not possible, however, because that question was deleted from the initial survey at the request of members of the Advisory Workgroup who subsequently resigned. The greatest confidence was expressed in technical information provided by local agencies and organizations although some of those entities withdrew from CSP participation and did not provide substantive input into the process.

A few respondents indicated that they were frustrated because the planning process moved forward without what they considered to be local approval or participation. There were also indications that concerns about landowner assurances, the SRCAF *Good Neighbor Policy* and the withdrawal of local representatives from formal participation in CSP affected respondent's perception of CSP. Related to these issues the ranking of the, "Influence of local landowners and other local interests in Colusa Subreach Planning process" decreased from 2005 from 4.73 to 3.42 on a 1 to 10 scale. While unfortunate, this response is considered to be a reflection of the peripheral events that transpired between 2005 and 2008.

B. Effectiveness of the Activities within the Planning Process

CSP was first conceived in 2001 by The Nature Conservancy and SRCAF in response to local stakeholder concerns that there needed to be a comprehensive process to plan ecosystem restoration activities in the Colusa Subreach. There was a desire expressed to assess the cumulative effects of restoration activities, something that could not occur when restoration projects were planned individually. The initial application for CALFED funding was developed by TNC with review and input from the SRCAF Manager and the two members of the SRCAF Board from Colusa County. The concepts in the initial application were refined in the Scope of Work that was approved in 2004 as part of the Recipient Agreement. The Scope of Work was further refined in early 2005 following the initial meetings of the Advisory Workgroup. An amendment to the Recipient Agreement permitted an increased focus on the specific landowner questions that were identified by the Workgroup.

Colusa Subreach Planning was impacted by a controversy that affected the entire Sacramento River Conservation Area. CSP was in its second year when concerns related to the ecosystem restoration and appropriate landowner assurances gained prominence. These issues had been under discussion for several years but they came to the forefront of SRCAF discussions and activities in late 2005 and in the first half of 2006. In the spring of 2005 the Advisory Workgroup discussed landowner assurances and determined that, while they were important local landowner questions, they were beyond the scope of resolution as part of CSP.

A Colusa County representative on the SRCAF Board who was also member of the Advisory Workgroup delivered a statement to the SRCAF Board at their December 1, 2005 meeting in which he asked that the Board, "Withdraw all support from ecosystem restoration within the Sacramento River Conservation Area until such time as the agencies come forth with tangible landowner assurances." This request was followed by a resolution of the Colusa County Board of Supervisors on December 13, 2005 recommending, "Cessation of funding to the SRCAF, the CSP

and all associated ecosystem restoration projects until such time as the Good Neighbor Policy drafted by the Landowners Assurances Committee (of the SRCAF) is adopted and implemented in its entirety.” The SRCAF Board, at its meeting of January 19, 2006, considered a motion to oppose ecosystem restoration until a good neighbor policy with certain landowner assurances was adopted but that motion failed by a vote of 2 to 7. The general sense of the Board’s was that the majority agreed that stronger landowner assurances were desirable but they did not believe that declaring opposition to ecosystem restoration was an appropriate way to try to achieve that end.

The SRCAF adopted a *Good Neighbor Policy* on May 25, 2006 as a “White Paper” and formally adopted the *Good Neighbor Policy* on March 15, 2007. The adopted White Paper and *Policy* did not, however, meet the expectations of the two Colusa County members of the SRCAF Board. The major concerns with the adopted *Policy* appeared to be that it did not contain desired landowner assurances including mandatory dispute resolution, provision for the SRCAF as a “Self Mitigating Area” and incidental take of Threatened and Endangered Species. At the time it was noted that the desired landowner assurance provisions were not included because they conflicted with state and federal statutes and regulatory procedures.

Shortly following the action at the SRCAF Board meeting on January 19, 2006 eight members from Colusa County resigned from the CSP Advisory Workgroup. A letter dated February 1, 2005 explained their action. That letter, which is contained in Appendix F, stated, “We write to express our disappointment with how the project has been implemented and to state our disapproval of the process that has taken place to date.” The letter also recommended a, “Complete cessation of funding to this effort.”

Perspectives on the reasons for the resignations vary. One perspective, expressed in the letter of resignation, was that the resigning members felt that they were not being truly heard in the Workgroup process and that they would not have the opportunity to meaningfully affect the outcome of CSP. The fact that the Workgroup was established to be “advisory”, and it was not vested with complete authority to make all key determinations regarding CSP was clearly an issue. The letter of resignation expressed the opinion that CSP was an, “Unbalanced and unresponsive process.” An alternative perspective held by TNC and SRCAF representatives to the process was that the resignations were substantially related to the landowner assurances issues and the inability of resource management agencies to agree to all desired assurances. It was noted that the Workgroup had reached agreement regarding its mission, landowner questions and planning and research projects through its first fifteen months. It was anticipated that the Workgroup could reach general agreement or compromise on many other questions in the future.

Some Colusa County interests also requested that TNC and SRCAF suspend Colusa Subreach Planning in 2006 until all the desired landowner assurances were in place. This suspension of the planning process was not agreed to for several reasons:

- CSP was about one-third finished and many subcontracts for public engagement, planning and research activities ongoing.
- The desired landowner assurances were in conflict with existing laws and agency procedures and therefore they were very unlikely to be forthcoming in the near future.

- It was felt that if the planning process were suspended as requested, the contractors and funding would be lost, CSP would not be completed and the potential benefits of subreach planning would not be realized.

A CALFED review of CSP was conducted in the summer of 2006 in response to the request that CALFED terminate funding for SRCAF and CSP. A letter outlining the findings and recommendations of that review is contained in Appendix G. The review concluded that the CSP planning process was meeting the requirements of the Recipient Agreement and recommended that funding should be continue for both CSP and SRCAF.

Colusa Subreach Planning was conducted in accordance with the Recipient Agreement which included a Scope of Work that was divided into specific Tasks. This section provides an introspective evaluation of the relative effectiveness of activities that occurred as part of the seven Tasks contained in the Scope of Work.

Task 1. Coordination and Outreach – The most critical CSP Task involved effective communication with the various stakeholders. As initially established in the *Public Engagement Plan*, multiple approaches were taken to establish two-way communication and involve the wide range of stakeholders in the planning process.

❖ **The SRCAF and TNC Partnership** was established through a Memorandum of Agreement and a subcontract for services. SRCAF provided assistance in managing the public engagement through direct meeting participation, preparation of Advisory Workgroup meeting records, mailed and emailed notifications and other stakeholder outreach services. The working relationship between SRCAF and TNC staff was excellent and SRCAF provided all the services that were anticipated in a positive and professional manner. The involvement of the SRCAF was also seen by some to bring a more practical perspective to CSP, less representative of the environmentalist point of view. Accordingly, the final landowner survey indicated that Subreach landowners placed greater confidence in SRCAF than TNC.

❖ **The Advisory Workgroup** served as the principal vehicle for stakeholder direction to the planning process. The original twenty-one member Workgroup functioned effectively for fifteen months after its initial meeting and completed all of the initial work that was anticipated including determination of principal landowner concerns, selection of planning and research projects, approval of scopes of work and consultant selection. After that point, however, the Workgroup membership was reduced to thirteen members as explained previously. Replacement of the resigned members was not proposed because it was felt that this would enflame the situation and jeopardize the informal participation that was still occurring.

The Advisory Workgroup continued to perform its role of advising the planning process after the resignations of February 2006 with reduced membership. Ten additional Workgroup meetings and five additional Subgroup meetings were held during the remaining term of the planning process. Some former Workgroup members attended various meetings on an unofficial basis but their overall level participation was greatly diminished. The lack of the majority of the Colusa County representatives on the Advisory Workgroup resulted in less local input into Workgroup discussions.

as only one Colusa County resident remained as an active participant. Despite this reduced participation, the Workgroup continued to serve its important role as the key stakeholder group advising the process.

- ❖ **Landowner Surveys** were conducted at the beginning of CSP and near the end of the planning process. The first survey provided initial insight into landowner concerns and it helped to direct the public engagement process. The final survey was interpreted to confirm that the controversy surrounding landowner assurances and efforts to terminate CSP had helped to shape the opinions of some landowners. The surveys provided valuable information but the fact that the respondents to the final survey were not necessarily the same persons that responded to the initial survey made it difficult to conclusively compare the findings of the two surveys.
- ❖ **Newsletters** were distributed to all subreach landowners, members of the Advisory Workgroup and other interested stakeholders in March or April of each year of the planning process. The newsletters provided an overview of the CSP activities and update on planning and research projects. In general, the newsletters elicited a small response from stakeholders but the final landowner survey results indicated that newsletters were one of the most useful communication tools. Articles about CSP were also placed in quarterly SRCAF newsletters to help inform stakeholders. The final landowner survey indicated that the limited articles that were appropriate in the SRCAF newsletters were of slightly less utility to Subreach landowners.
- ❖ **Public Meetings and Workshops** were held during the process. Three Public meetings and three workshops were held. The initial meeting was well attended as was the second meeting related to recreation planning. The third public information meeting on flood control had a lesser attendance. Two of the three workshops related to the development of recreation plans were well attended and much public input was received. The final landowner survey indicated that public meetings were relatively useful for Subreach landowners.
- ❖ **CSP Website** was established as a subset of the SRCAF website. It provided basic information about CSP and it provided access to all of the substantive products of CSP. The limits of the system did not permit monitoring of the usage of the website but the provision of online information is considered a basic requirement for any substantial public engagement program. The final landowner survey indicated that the CSP website was little used by the individuals that responded to the survey.
- ❖ **Individual Landowner Meetings** were an essential part of the planning process. Multiple contacts were made with the landowners that had property in the immediate vicinity of the eight restoration tracts. These contacts were critical to effective restoration planning as well as compliance with SRCAF's Good Neighbor Policy. The time spent and relationships built with these neighbors were especially important because most of the neighboring owners indicated either support for restoration or no opposition to restoration adjoining their property. Only one neighboring landowner indicated that he was opposed to nearby habitat restoration. This was in marked contrast with some other local interests who indicated that they were opposed to any restoration of riparian habitat. The final landowner survey

also indicated that meetings with neighboring landowners were a relatively valuable means of communication.

Task 2. Baseline Assessments – Baseline assessments were conducted to provide the information base required to support the planning of habitat restoration. Three contractors were engaged to provide the necessary information.

- ❖ **Subreach Background Report** was designed to be a basic information source for the planning process. It was reviewed in detail by the Advisory Workgroup. The original draft was expanded to include additional information regarding the local area and the agricultural economy at the request of the Workgroup. The *Report* served as a resource for stakeholders and contractors throughout the planning process.
- ❖ **Tract-specific Baseline Assessments** were prepared for each of the eight potential habitat restoration tracts. These assessments were absolutely essential in the habitat planning process. The development of the reports required longer than originally anticipated due to a number of factors but the information that they contained supported an efficient process in the preparation of restoration plans.
- ❖ **Small Mammals Research** was conducted under the same contract as the tract-specific baseline assessments. The analysis focused on small mammals that are considered to be agricultural pest species. It sampled their relative abundance in different types of habitat including agriculture, young restoration, older restoration and remnant habitat. The results provided important data to support *the Pest and Regulatory Effects Study* and meetings with neighboring landowners and the preparation restoration plans.
- ❖ **Insect Pest Research** was conducted to determine effects of riparian habitat on insect pests and insect pest control in the interface between agricultural and riparian habitat on the Sacramento River. Like the small mammals research, the results provided important data to support *the Pest and Regulatory Effects Study* and meetings with neighboring landowners and the preparation restoration plans.
- ❖ **Cultural Resources** baseline assessment was contracted to provide the necessary information to ensure that restoration activities did not impact important cultural resources. The assessment was completed on schedule and met all established expectations. One potential cultural site was identified in one of the proposed restoration tracts and the recommendations for dealing with that site were incorporated into the restoration plan for the site. Cultural resources assessment is considered an essential part of habitat restoration planning.
- ❖ **Topographic Mapping** was developed for the entire Subreach using Light Detection and Ranging (LIDAR) technology. The new mapping provided much greater detail and reliability than previous mapping that was generated from aerial photos. The output of this detailed mapping is in the form of data files that can be manipulated in a Geographic Information System (GIS) to provide a wide range of products. The topographic mapping provided

important information to support the hydraulic modeling and the development of restoration plans.

Task 3. Modeling – Early in the CSP process it was determined that the only necessary modeling under this Task would be two-dimensional hydraulic modeling to assess the effects of habitat restoration on the flood control system and neighboring properties. This modeling was conducted through a contract that also included addressing landowner questions related to the flood management system.

- ❖ **Hydraulic Modeling and Analysis** is an essential component of habitat restoration planning that is also required in order to apply for encroachment permits from the Central Valley Flood Protection Board. The hydraulic modeling and analysis also established technical creditability with the CDWR, local engineers and other stakeholders who were willing to invest the time required to understand the findings of the analysis. As part of the draft and final reports the contractor developed new and more effective graphics that demonstrated that the proposed restoration projects would not result in flood issues. Overall, the Task was a very worthwhile and essential effort.

Task 4. Focal Area Planning – Focal Area Planning was designed to respond to concerns and questions raised by local stakeholders. The Task also included development of habitat restoration plans that were based on information generated from the entire CSP process.

- ❖ **Recreation Plans** were identified as being particularly important to local stakeholders as part of the identification of Principal Landowner questions under Task 5. They also provided the opportunity to coordinate riparian habitat with compatible recreation and, in turn, relate habitat conservation to strong local interests. Two plans were prepared, the *Master Plan for the Colusa-Sacramento River State Recreation Area* and the *Colusa Subreach Recreation Access Plan*. These plans responded directly to local concerns and helped to establish creditability and working relationships with local stakeholders. This was especially true for the City of Colusa. Development of the *Master Plan* for the CSRSRA demonstrated that TNC and SRCF shared objectives with the City and that an effective partnership could exist.
- ❖ **Restoration Plans** were prepared for each of the eight potential restoration Tracts. These plans were a key product of CSP that were specifically required in the Scope of Work. The restoration plans incorporated information and ideas drawn from all the other Tasks and from meetings with neighboring landowners.

Task 5. Landowner Questions – Landowner questions and related planning and research projects were identified by the Advisory Workgroup while it still had its original membership. These planning and research projects directly addressed ten of the highest priority landowner questions.

- ❖ **Priority Landowner Questions** were identified after much discussion on the part of the Advisory Workgroup. These identified landowner questions, or concerns as they were also called, became the focus of the planning

- ❖ **Research Projects** and planning projects as noted in Task 4 were chosen by the Advisory Workgroup to address landowner concerns. The Workgroup also approved scopes of work for these projects and participated in the selection of contractors. The research projects supported the development of the restoration plans for tracts in the Subreach. The new information and techniques generated will support future ecosystem restoration plans and projects throughout the Sacramento River Conservation Area. The development of projects that address specific landowner questions also was important because it helped to establish creditability with some stakeholders.

Task 6. Project Management and Administration includes standards for basic management of the planning process in accordance with Ecosystem Restoration Program grant procedures. This Subreach Planning Report was also prepared as specified in this Task.

- ❖ **Quarterly Reports** were prepared to keep GAP Services and CDFG apprised of the status of the planning process and compliance with Recipient Agreement requirements. The reporting was valuable because it provided a regular opportunity to assess the project compliance and assess any needed adjustments.
- ❖ **Subcontractor Selection and Data Management** requirements were specified to ensure that Ecosystem Restoration Program grant procedures were met. The standards were practical and compliance was achieved.
- ❖ **Subreach Planning Report** synthesizes the results of CSP and recommends a strategy for future management of ecosystem restoration in the Subreach. This *draft Report* will be circulated to stakeholders for input and provided to GCAP Services and DFG for review and comment. The final Report will incorporate appropriate revisions. The final *Subreach Planning Report* will incorporate appropriate revisions. In doing so it will provide a chronicle of the planning process and a summary of the results and recommendations of CSP.

Task 7 Project Closure directs the closeout of the Recipient Agreement including administrative and financial details. A Project Closeout Summary Report will complete this process

C. Achievement of the Project Goal and Objectives

The Primary Goal of Colusa Subreach Planning as established in the Recipient Agreement was to

Increase citizen stakeholder involvement in determining realistic conservation strategies and projects for protecting and restoring riparian vegetation along the Sacramento River, between River Miles 143.5 and 164.5, compatible with the flood control system and other economic and environmental uses of the floodplain

The Goal was defined through five Objectives. An evaluation of the achievement of each of these Objectives through the CSP process is provided:

a) Ensure an open and inclusive planning process consistent with the SRCAF principles and guidelines with multiple opportunities for input by local stakeholders, agencies and private interest groups.

The planning process was open to all stakeholders that chose to participate and multiple forms of notice were used to inform stakeholders of input opportunities and project results. In general, stakeholders chose to become involved when meetings were focused on topics of specific interest or concern to them. All outreach efforts included in the Public Engagement Plan were carried out and the planning process was consistent with SRCAF principles and guidelines. The withdrawal of some stakeholders from the process and the related publicity that followed may have limited overall participation of local stakeholders but the level of involvement by local stakeholders, agencies and private interest groups was substantially greater than that which occurred before CSP. Thus, this objective was met.

b) Collect baseline data and analyze existing data to inform floodplain management and compliment long-term monitoring programs.

Baseline Assessments were conducted that included tract-specific assessments, the small mammal research, the insect pest research, the cultural resources assessment and LIDAR topographic mapping. The sum of the products clearly exceeded the expectations established in the Scope of Work such that this objective was clearly met.

c) Build and calibrate tools (including models) to evaluate the effects of restoration on land management alternatives and flood control infrastructure specific to the Princeton – Colusa Subreach.

A two-dimensional hydraulic model was developed for the entire Subreach in addition to new analysis tools and new methods of displaying model results. The hydraulic model was successfully used to evaluate the effects of restoration projects on both the flood management system and neighboring properties. It was also used to answer other landowner questions related to flood management. This objective was met.

d) Develop design alternatives and identified implementation projects, incorporating ecosystem restoration and related compatible flood protection, recreation and other land use benefits.

The master plan for the CSRSRA, the recreation access plan and the eight restoration plans integrated ecosystem restoration with flood management, compatible recreation opportunities and adjoining land uses. This objective was met.

e) Address stakeholder concerns and research priority questions.

Planning and research projects were completed that directly addressed the landowner questions that were identified by the Advisory Workgroup. The research projects supported the development of the Strategy for the Colusa Subreach. The new information and techniques generated through CSP will also support future ecosystem restoration plans and projects throughout the Sacramento River Conservation Area. This objective was met.